

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

TRANSLATION

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

To:

Date of mailing
(day/month/year)

Applicant's or agent's file reference

S06P0079W000

FOR FURTHER ACTION

See paragraph 2 below

International application No.

PCT/JP2006/300674

International filing date (day/month/year)

12.01.2006

Priority date (day/month/year)

31.01.2005

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

Applicant

SONY CORPORATION

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☐ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☒ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/JP

Date of completion of this opinion

Authorized officer

Facsimile No.

Telephone No.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2006/300674

Box No. I Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of:

- ☒ the international application in the language in which it was filed
- ☐ the translation of the international application into _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (Rule 12.3(a) and 23.1(b)).

2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:

a. type of material

- ☐ a sequence listing
- ☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing

b. format of material

- ☐ on paper
- ☐ in electronic form

c. time of filing/furnishing

- ☐ contained in the international application as filed
- ☐ filed together with the international application in electronic form
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search

3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.

4. Additional comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2006/300674

Box No. IV

Lack of unity of invention

1. ☒ In response to the invitation (Form PCT/ISA/206) to pay additional fees the applicant has, within the applicable time limit:
- ☒ paid additional fees
 - ☐ paid additional fees under protest and, where applicable, the protest fee
 - ☐ paid additional fees under protest but the applicable protest fee was not paid
 - ☐ not paid additional fees
2. ☐ This Authority found that the requirement of unity of invention is not complied with and chose not to invite the applicant to pay additional fees.
3. This Authority considers that the requirement of unity of invention in accordance with Rules 13.1, 13.2 and 13.3 is
- ☐ complied with
 - ☒ not complied with for the following reasons:

The "special technical features" of the inventions, the claims of which are classified as given below, are as follows. Since there is no technical relationship among these inventions involving one or more of the same or corresponding technical features, these inventions are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept.

Claims 1-4

An imaging device having an image input section comprising an imaging unit and a front end and a signal processing unit for processing a plurality of imaging signals from the image input section and generating a primary color signal, wherein the imaging unit has primary color-based and complementary color-based color separation filters and an imaging element to which color lights separated by the color separation filters are inputted; and the signal processing unit generates a primary color signal by performing matrix operation processing of a plurality of signals obtained by using the primary color-based and complementary color-based color separation filters in a first region where input image data is at low and medium brightness levels, and generates a primary color signal by performing matrix operation processing of a plurality of signals obtained by using primary color-based color separation filters in a second region where input image data is at a high brightness level

Claims 5-7

An imaging device comprising primary color-based RGB (red, green and blue) three-color filters and complementary color-based YC (yellow and cyan) two-color filters, five-color filters in total, wherein by disposing G filters close to the brightness characteristics of a human eye in a checkered form, space information four times as much as that of other colors can be obtained

4. Consequently, this opinion has been established in respect of the following parts of the international application:
- ☒ all parts
 - ☐ the parts relating to claims Nos. _____

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2006/300674

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability;
citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims 1-7	YES
	Claims	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims 1-7	YES
	Claims	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims 1-7	YES
	Claims	NO

2. Citations and explanations:

Document 1: JP, 2001-359114, A (Fuji Photo Film Co., Ltd.), 26 December, 2001 (26.12.01)
Document 2: JP, 2000-315784, A (Olympus Optical Co., Ltd.), 14 November, 2000 (14.11.00)

Claims 1-7

The subject matters of claims 1-7 are neither described in any of the documents cited in the ISR nor obvious to a person skilled in the art.